UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/589,294	08/14/2006	Michel Cornaz	930024-2056	6947	
Ronald R. Santi	7590 03/20/200 ucci	EXAMINER			
Frommer Lawre	_	HARTMANN, GARY S			
745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•				3671	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/20/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/589,294	CORNAZ, MICHEL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Gary Hartmann	3671				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Au	igust 2006.					
· <u> </u>	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.	4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 August 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	majorita (umdon 25 H.C.C. \$ 440/o)	(4) = : (5)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
•	a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 14 August 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR

1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent

literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that

portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information

referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it does not include section headings (e.g.,

"Summary of the Invention," "Brief Description of the Drawings," etc.). Appropriate correction

is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because process steps should include an --ing-- ending; for

example, "introduced" should be --introducing--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of the term "it" in the claims is indefinite because of the equivocal nature of the term. Each recitation of "it" must be replaced with a positive recitation of a specific term.

Claims 8 and 11 are process claims but do not properly recite any process steps.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rasmussen (U.S. Patent 4,127,349).

Rasmussen discloses a slab having sections (2) divided by a groove (Figures 1-3).

Column 2, lines 65-66 specifically teaches the slabs to be broken at the grooves.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasmussen, as applied above.

Regarding size, it is standard practice in the art to use any size best suited to a particular paving application. For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used any sizes for Rasmussen.

Regarding claim 6, all steps are disclosed (column 3, lines 3-12) except for pressing. It is well known to press a material when molding in order to obtain a well formed finished product. For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have pressed Rasmussen.

Regarding claim 7, there is no recited distinction between "facing concrete" and "ordinary concrete"; therefore, claim recitations are met by Rasmussen.

Regarding claim 9, it is well known that striking can break a frangible product. Because Rasmussen is designed to be frangible, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have divided the slab by striking.

Regarding claim 10, it is common practice to fill a joint between slabs in the manner claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have filled joints of Rasmussen with filler or mortar in order to obtain a desired finished product.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Hartmann whose telephone number is 571-272-6989. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Will can be reached on 571-272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gary Hartmann/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3671